

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,507	02/27/2004	Greg Matthews	01-25 C1	7421
30031 MICHAEL V	7590 10/18/2007 V. HAAS		EXAM	INER
RESPIRONICS, INC.			MENDOZA, MICHAEL G	
1010 MURRY RIDGE LANE MURRYSVILLE, PA 15668			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
	•			
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
·	10/788,507	MATTHEWS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael G. Mendoza	3734			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT a, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju	uly 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8-11,15-17,20,21,27-</u> 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-7, 12-14, 18, 19, 22-26, and 32</u> is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	- <u>31 and 33</u> is/are withdrawi	n from consideration.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand tion is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		·			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/2004</u>. 	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 			

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-7, 12-14, 18, 19, 22-26, and 32 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7168429. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the structural limitations set forth in claims 1-7, 12*14, 18, 19,22-26, and 32 of the instant application are also claimed in the patent, e.g. a pressure generating system, a patient circuit, a monitoring system, and a controller.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,507 Page 3

Art Unit: 3734

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claim 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jafari et al. 6626175.
- 5. Jafari et al. teaches an auto-titration pressure support system comprising: a pressure generating system 34; a patient circuit having a first end and a second end (see fig. 1); a monitoring system 38, 60 & 70; a controller for controlling the pressure generating system based on the output of the monitoring system, wherein the controller performs a trend analysis on the output of the monitoring system; wherein the controller determines a plurality of values for a monitored breather parameter over a period of time and performs a long-term trend analysis and a short-term trend analysis on the plurality of values for the monitored breath parameter in deciding whether to cause the pressure generating system to adjust the pressure level of the flow of breathing gas (col. 12, lines 39-62); wherein a result of the long-term trend analysis and a short-term trend analysis for each monitored breath parameter are used to determine a trend analysis vote associated with each monitored breath parameter, wherein the trend analysis votes for a plurality of monitored breath parameters are accumulated to

Application/Control Number: 10/788,507

Art Unit: 3734

Page 4

determine a final vote value, and wherein the controller causes the pressure generating system to adjust the pressure level of the flow of breathing gas based on the final vote value (col. 16, lines 36-51).

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Mendoza whose telephone number is (571) 272-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MM

MM

MICHAEL J. HAYES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER